

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1, 8, 15, 20, 27, 38, and 44 have been amended and a new claim 53 has been added. Claims 1-4, 7-8, 15-23, 26-27, 38, 40-44, and 53 are now pending.

Applicant's amendments and remarks after Final are appropriate under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 because they address the Office's remarks in the Final Action, and thus could not have been presented earlier. In addition, the amendments and remarks should be entered to place the case in better form for appeal.

35 U.S.C. §103 Claim Rejections

Claims 1-4, 7, 15-23, 26-27, 38, and 40-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over U.S. Patent No. 6,463,474 to Fuh et al. (hereinafter, "Fuh"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,701,415 to Hendren, III (hereinafter, "Hendren") (*Office Action* p.3).

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Fuh in view of Hendren, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,940,594 to Ali et al. (hereinafter, "Ali") (*Office Action* p.8).

Claim 1 recites a domain controller configured to:

track individual users that request access to the network system via the domain controller at the remote network site, the domain controller configured to track a user by identifying the remote site where the user requests the access, recording a time at which the request is made, and monitoring when the network access information is cached for the user that requests the access;

1 receive a first network access request from the user and validate the
2 first network access request with the network access information
3 maintained at the network server when the network access
4 information is not cached at the domain controller;

5 Support for the amendment to claim 1 can be found at least at pages 8-12
6 and at Figs. 1-4 of the Application as filed.

7 Fuh does not teach or suggest a domain controller which is configured to
8 track individual users who request access to the network system via the domain
9 controller, as recited in claim 1. More specifically, Fuh does not teach or suggest
10 a domain controller configured to identify the remote site where a user requests
11 the access, to record a time at which the request is made, and to monitor when the
12 network access information is cached for the user that requests the access.

13 The Office cites to col.2, lines 32-54 of Fuh for tracking individual users.
14 This section of Fuh only describes configuring a path through a firewall once a
15 user has been authenticated and authorized. This section of Fuh does not describe
16 the tracking features recited in claim 1. Hendren also does not teach or suggest a
17 domain controller configured to track individual users who request access to the
18 network system via the domain controller, as recited in claim 1.

19 In addition, Fuh does not teach or suggest a domain controller configured to
20 receive a first network access request from a user and to validate the first network
21 access request with the network access information maintained at the network
22 server when the network access information is not cached at the domain controller,
23 as recited in claim 1.

24 Instead, Fuh describes that when a client submits a request (*e.g.*, an HTTP
25 packet), the authentication proxy denies the HTTP packet if the source IP address
of the packet does not match and the authentication proxy, and makes no attempt

1 at authentication of this first network access request (*Fuh* col.11, lines 28-32). In
2 such a situation, *Fuh* teaches that a new authentication cache can be created for the
3 user after the first network access request has been denied. Thereafter, new login
4 information (*i.e.*, a second network access request) can be requested from the user,
5 and the authentication proxy can then authenticate the client from the new
6 authentication cache which was subsequently created (*Fuh* col.11, lines 49-55).
7 *Fuh* does not receive and validate a first network access request from a user client
8 unless the authentication proxy (at the firewall/router) has an authentication cache
9 from which to authenticate the client.

10 Contrary to *Fuh*, Applicant claims that the domain controller (which is
11 remote from the network server) validates the first network access request with the
12 network access information maintained at the network server when the network
13 access information is not cached at the domain controller, as recited in claim 1.
14 The amendment to claim 1 emphasizes that a first network access request is
15 validated by the domain controller when the network access information
16 corresponding to the requesting user is not currently cached at the domain
17 controller.

18 Hendren also does not teach or suggest the features recited in claim 1, nor
19 has the Office cited Hendren for the deficiencies of *Fuh*. Hendren merely
20 describes a cache for resources, such as Web pages, and does not provide any
21 discussion of network access validation or authentication.

22 As such, the *Fuh*-Hendren combination fails to teach or suggest all of the
23 features recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over the
24 *Fuh*-Hendren combination for at least the reasons described above, and Applicant
25

1 respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn, and that claim 1 be
2 allowed in the Examiner's next action.

3
4 It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable
5 base claim is also allowable. Accordingly claims 2-4 and 7 are allowable by
6 virtue of their dependency upon claim 1. Additionally, some or all of claims 2-4
7 and 7 are allowable over the Fuh-Hendren combination for independent reasons.

8
9 Claim 8 recites that "the network server is further configured to replicate a
10 partial copy of the user objects from the domain controller such that the replicated
11 partial copy of the user objects can be used to identify the network group
12 memberships for the individual user." Support for the amendment can be found at
13 least at page 7, line 15 to page 8, line 18, and at Figs. 2-4 of the Application as
14 filed.

15 The Fuh and/or Hendren and/or Ali combination do not teach or suggest a
16 network server configured to replicate a partial copy of the user objects from the
17 domain controller, as recited in claim 8. Further, claim 8 is allowable by virtue of
18 its dependency upon allowable claim 1 as described above in the response to the
19 rejection of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 8 is allowable over the Fuh-Hendren-Ali
20 combination and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be
21 withdrawn.

1 Claim 15 recites a remote server configured to:

2 receive a first network access request from a user and validate the
3 first network access request with the network information
4 maintained at the global information server when the network
5 information corresponding to the user is not cached at the remote
6 server;

7 track individual users that request access to the network from the
8 remote server by identifying the remote server where the user
9 requests the access, recording a time at which the request is made,
10 and monitoring when the network information is cached for the user
11 that requests the access;

12 Support for the amendment to claim 15 can be found at least at pages 8-12
13 and at Figs. 2-4 of the Application as filed.

14 As described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1, Fuh and/or
15 Hendren do not teach or suggest a remote server (domain controller) which is
16 configured to track individual users who request access to the network system
17 from the remote server, as recited in claim 15. Further, Fuh and/or Hendren do not
18 teach or suggest a remote server configured to receive a first network access
19 request from a user and to validate the first network access request with the
20 network access information maintained at the network server when the network
21 access information is not currently cached at the domain controller, as recited in
22 claim 15.

23 As such, the Fuh-Hendren combination fails to teach or suggest all of the
24 features recited in claim 15. Accordingly, claim 15 is allowable over the
25 Fuh-Hendren combination for at least the reasons described above, and Applicant
26 respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn, and that claim 15 be
27 allowed in the Examiner's next action.

1
2 Claims 16-19 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 15.
3 Additionally, some or all of claims 16-19 are allowable over the Fuh-Hendren
4 combination for independent reasons.

5
6 Claim 20 recites a method comprising:

7 validating a first network access request from a user at a second
8 network site with the network access information maintained at the
9 first network site when the network access information identifying
the user is not cached at the second network site; and

10 tracking individual user requests to access the network from the
11 second network site by identifying the second network site where the
12 user requests the access, recording a time at which the user requests
the access, and monitoring when the network access information
identifying the user is cached for the user making the request.

13
14 Support for the amendment to claim 20 can be found at least at pages 8-12
15 and at Figs. 2-4 of the Application as filed.

16 As described above in response to the rejection of claim 1, Fuh and/or
17 Hendren do not teach or suggest tracking individual users who request access to
18 the network system from the second network site, as recited in claim 20. Further,
19 Fuh and/or Hendren do not teach or suggest validating a first network access
20 request from a user at a second network site with the network access information
21 maintained at the first network site when the network access information
22 identifying the user is not cached at the second network site, as recited in claim 20.

23 As such, the Fuh-Hendren combination fails to teach or suggest all of the
24 features recited in claim 20. Accordingly, claim 20 is allowable over the
25 Fuh-Hendren combination for at least the reasons described above, and Applicant

1 respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn, and that claim 20 be
2 allowed in the Examiner's next action.

3
4 Claims 21-23 and 26-27 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon
5 claim 20. Additionally, some or all of claims 21-23 and 26-27 are allowable over
6 the Fuh-Hendren combination for independent reasons.

7
8 Claim 38 recites a method comprising:

9 validating the first network access request at the remote server with
10 the network information maintained at the global information server
11 when the network information corresponding to the user is not
cached at the remote server;

12 tracking users that request access to the network via the remote
13 server by identifying where the access requests originate and
recording a time at which the access requests are made;

14 Support for the amendment to claim 38 can be found at least at pages 8-12
15 and at Figs. 2-4 of the Application as filed.

16 As described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1, Fuh and/or
17 Hendren do not teach or suggest tracking users that request access to the network
18 system from the remote server, as recited in claim 38. Further, Fuh and/or
19 Hendren do not teach or suggest validating a first network access request at a
20 remote server with network information maintained at the global information
21 server when the network information corresponding to the user is not cached at the
22 remote server, as recited in claim 38.

23 As such, the Fuh-Hendren combination fails to teach or suggest all of the
24 features recited in claim 38. Accordingly, claim 38 is allowable over the
25

1 Fuh-Hendren combination for at least the reasons described above, and Applicant
2 respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn, and that claim 38 be
3 allowed in the Examiner's next action.

4
5 Claims 40-44 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 38.
6 Additionally, some or all of claims 40-44 are allowable over the Fuh-Hendren
7 combination for independent reasons.

8
9 **New Claim**

10 New claim 53 is presented for examination, support for which can be found
11 at least at page 4, pages 5-12, and at Figs. 1-4 of the Application as originally
12 filed. Applicant believes that claim 53 is allowable as presented, and requests
13 allowance in the Examiner's next action.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 **Conclusion**

2 Pending claims 1-4, 7-8, 15-23, 26-27, 38, 40-44, and 53 are in condition
3 for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the
4 subject application. If any issues remain that preclude issuance of this application,
5 the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a
6 subsequent Action.

7 Respectfully Submitted,

8
9 Dated: May 13, 2005

By: _____

David A. Morasch
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Reg. No. 42,905
(509) 324-9256 x 210